

Why Employ an Architect?

REVEREND JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

Father LaFarge, well-known Associate Editor of "America" and the son of John LaFarge, the first mural painter and decorator of real distinction this country produced, discusses the function of the architect and the necessity of employing one on even the smallest projects. The article is reprinted from Liturgical Arts—the new, beautifully illustrated quarterly established to improve standards of taste, craftsmanship, and liturgical correctness.

BEFORE accepting any answer to the question which is the title to this paper, the reader will probably ask, "Why bring it up?" He may go further, and inquire as to the competency of the writer on such matters. One reply will suffice for both queries.

The writer is not an architect nor a patron of architects. He has erected no cathedrals, universities, or mausoleums. His sole ventures in this line have been some rectangular yellow-pine structures dotting a wooded countryside—though his experience with these has taught some lessons. In every diocese are priests better equipped than he to discuss the need of employing an architect for parish constructions.

However, his lot on earth has brought him, from childhood, into intimate contact with architects and with others whose work is closely associated with architecture; so that he has a certain familiarity with the reasons for the architect's being, as well as with the misunderstandings under which they labor.

Architecture has this specialty as a profession, that it unites such widely different fields of thought and work. The beautiful and the useful are yoked under one command. The complexity of modern construction must impose a certain strain on conscientious architects, though they do not like to admit it. In olden days, when materials were simple, massive, and few, stone and mortar acted as a healthy restraint on a too soaring imagination. Today, we outsiders can only sit and marvel at the architect's mastery of a babel

of constructional intricacies, from radiator valves to cork insulation, from invisible hinges to concrete piles. But with all their competency, they do not find it so easy to present their own case. They meet with the old problem of demonstrating the obvious. There are people who believe that they can dispense with physicians for their bodies, as with the priest for their souls. In both instances, and similarly with the architect, it is the dire consequences which argue plainest for common sense. Today, however, architects are becoming increasingly vocal; and I take the liberty to quote freely from some of their recent utterances.

The employment of an architect, after all, is simply "a logical development of the solution of the problem facing anyone who plans to build anything." The architectural magazine, *Pencil Points*, in its issue of July, 1930 (page 569), states plainly the architect's what and wherefore:

The architect is, like the lawyer or the physician, a professional man. That means that he has nothing to sell you other than disinterested personal service. His knowledge of the art of designing buildings and of supervising their construction—knowledge acquired by years of study and apprenticeship—makes him an expert in his field and makes his assistance of value to you, who may know little or nothing of such matters. His ability to make this knowledge effective in your service is his sole "stock in trade." He is not, as some people erroneously suppose, a dealer in blueprints or in plans and specifications, any more than a physician is a dealer in prescriptions. These things are simply instruments of service. What you pay the architect for is the wisdom of training and experience which enables him to write your correct building prescription in the form of drawings and specifications, and so insure that you get what you want.

"The average client," remarks the American Institute of Architects in its folder on the "Functions of the Architect," "is unequipped to design or direct the construction of his building. His attempt to do so is as certain to court disaster as would be his untrained effort to supplant his physician for his own cure."

The architect, however, is not a mere maker of plans.

Those who visualize the architect in this light also believe that, once having secured a "set of plans," they are fully equipped to carry the building project to a successful conclusion. Nothing could be further from the truth. The making of plans is often the smallest and most insignificant part of the architect's work. . . . The architect is your professional adviser in such matters as the following: The drawing up of proper contracts; the taking out of necessary permits; the proper time and amounts of payments to contractors; the cover-

ing of the work by insurance while under construction, not only against fire but against personal liability for accidents to workmen or to passers-by; the provision for connection with public utilities, such as electrical current, gas, sewer; the proper guarantees from contractors as to durability, tightness against weather; the innumerable questions as to which sub-contractor's province covers certain work; as to who pays for water, heat, and light used during the construction of the building; the placing of responsibility for protecting adjoining buildings.¹

It is just these practical considerations which make the architect's services necessary not only for the building of a church, where considerations of beauty and creative imagination come specially to the fore, but in the more prosaic needs of a school or rectory building. Moreover, a point frequently overlooked, until dire experience has given the pastor some sleepless nights, the architect is needed for remodelling quite as much as for original construction. Indeed, the architectural problems presented by remodelling are often more intricate than when there is plain sailing from a new foundation. The architect is needed not only for the erection of the building, but for its completion, for its finishing down to every detail. It is in this work of finishing that the architect will often gather up the fruits of his companionship with the growing building, and display his finest talent and skill.

Once upon a time this writer fell heir to the outside shell of a concrete-block church which had been erected by a good man who was great and noble in every respect save that he thought he could dispense with an architect. The church was conceived—as it was consummated—in financial scarcity. The contractor was honest and thoroughly competent, as a contractor, but he was not an architect. The result? When we came to finish the inside of the church we found there was no conceivable way of passing from one of the rooms constructed over the sacristy to the other, save by creeping through a twenty-foot passage eighteen inches high. No means could be devised for heating these rooms in winter or keeping them from being airless ovens in summer. The real apartment *de luxe*, cosy in January and an aerie fit for the Lady of Shalott in summer, was in the belfry, whence ever and anon the pastor had to ban the youth of the parish. But it was too much cumbered with bell-

¹*This Man the Architect*, booklet published by Charles Scribner and Sons, 1930.

rope to make it fit for pernocation. The practical value for mission work, of that sacristy dropped about sixty per cent. The cause? Lack of professional planning.

Missionaries, anyhow, are apt to be shy of architects. This is natural enough, since the missionary usually has to trust to his own competence in everything from carburetors to chicken raising; and his bank margin is so thin as to be invisible. But this hoped-for saving is delusive. The poorest missionary pays in the end for his short-sightedness. In my own mental gallery are numerous instances of structural misfortunes, attributable to excellent persons who were somehow persuaded they could "make their own plans," or at least supervise their own constructions.

I have in mind a series of small churches put up in a tropical country without any provision for a sacristy; a four-story school building planned—happily, not erected—without any stairs; a one-story school building without access to a capacious windowed attic; a school so arranged that only one half of the rooms could be heated, with a chimney flue too small to draw; the (wooden) altar of a large country church that was built longer than the high altar of Saint Peter's in Rome, yet the sanctuary too small for more than a couple of diminutive altar boys. Confessionals stuck in as afterthoughts; misplaced belfries, statues, and organ lofts; wasted heating apparatus; awkward entrances and exits to sanctuary or sacristy; even a church without any front entrance at all—are but a few of the memories.

Once I was shown over a new two-story combined stone school and convent by the zealous pastor who made the countryside ring with his "do-it-all-myself" philosophy. The plan? A long, gloomy corridor on both floors, and stairs specially devised, as it were, to serve as a neat firetrap for the children.

"But is not the builder, or the contractor, an experienced man? Why cannot the entire thing be entrusted to him?" It seems to me that this persistent question is aptly answered by Edgar I. Williams in *Pencil Points* for September, 1930 (page 754):

Any building project has two important aims: (1) The creation of an efficient, good-looking, well-built building. (2) The spending of money so that good value is received for the amount dispersed.

There are two ways in which a building project can be accom-

plished. The first is between two parties, call them the owner and the builder. The second is between three parties, the owner, the architect, and the builder. In each case the operation is the same. Plans are made, estimates are procured, contracts let and work is done. In one case he may think he does not pay for all of it, but he does.

Plans cost money. They are necessary in order that an owner may know what he is to spend, just as much as to show him how his building will work, and how it will look. No builder can give this service free to an owner—none does.

If the owner puts himself in the hands of a builder he goes on trial in a court in which, as plaintiff, he is opposed by a defendant who is both defendant and judge. This is no reflection upon the integrity of builders, it is a reflection upon the judgment of owners.

Plans are best drawn by those who make a business of planning: architects. Those who do so are men trained in mind to catch an owner's ideas, put them in form on paper and to give to this form reason, efficiency, order, and good looks. The plans are then described by careful specifications. When the owner sees on paper what he will get, he will also know approximately what it will cost, and it is then time to seek a builder.

Granted these arguments, the objector may say, granted that the architect is in himself a necessary individual, does there not remain the unpleasant fact that it is difficult to avoid misunderstandings with him? May it not be the fear of such misunderstandings rather than disbelief in the mission of the architect, which drives many a pastor back upon the expedient of trying to "do without?" This is a delicate topic; one which, I trust, future contributors to *Liturgical Arts* will take up in detail. Indeed, *Liturgical Arts*, and the work of the Liturgical Arts Society, which it represents, will naturally aid in removing one great source of such misunderstandings; lack of a common understanding between architect and clergyman as to the architectural requirements laid down by the Church herself.

Suffice it to say now, that, apart from the aforesaid cause, no small number of such misunderstandings come from the failure of architectural patrons to understand certain points on which professional men, from all I can observe, are particularly sensitive; and, perhaps, from the failure of architects to make clear these very points.

Architects strenuously object to the practice of being asked to "submit sketches" in order that their merits may be chosen. They feel about this pretty much as would a Catholic priest if he were asked to travel about, as some ministers are required to do, submitting specimen sermons

before being assigned to a parish, or a physician if asked to submit a tentative diagnosis. The "sketch," no matter how sketchy, how tentative, is a *professional service*; it constitutes just as definitely a legal title to remuneration as does the most finished set of specifications. I have known some of my clerical brethren to feel deeply hurt when the architect sent in a bill for a sketch (and a fairly finished elevation at that). But the fault was not all with the patron. In each case the architect should, I think, have warned his prospective but unsuspecting client that dalliance meant dollars.

The practice of holding competitions, as a means for selecting an architect, is also vigorously condemned, save "in some instances, where public work seems to require the final choice of an architect in a manner free from any suggestion of personal preference; . . . but these will be entered by reputable practitioners only when conducted under approved methods of procedure, and usually when each competitor is paid for the study and work that these preliminary drawings necessitate" (*This Man the Architect*).

Another fruitful source of misunderstanding is that patron and client have failed to come to a sufficiently clear agreement, at the beginning, as to remuneration or as to plans. Says the American Institute of Architecture:

The fees to be paid should always be discussed frankly by owners and architect and determined clearly at the beginning of the operation. If the proper amount or rate of charge cannot be settled until the extent of the work has become definite, a preliminary charge for consultation, early sketches, or estimates will usually be found acceptable to the architect. . . . An architect may be employed to make drawings without supervision of the construction or to supervise without having made the design, but this is generally unsatisfactory for both owner and architect.

Too many pains cannot be taken by the client to understand, and the architect to explain, the preliminary drawings, which are apt to "remain Greek to the client, just as the tailor's crude patterns." "Prolonged and careful study of the early drawings, until these do bring understanding, is the client's duty and responsibility." Hence "working drawings should not be begun until the scheme is well developed and determined. The owner should freely give his personal time to an examination of these drawings, the de-

tails, and specifications."² Nevertheless, "no exact estimate of the final cost of the building can be made during the preliminary states. . . . Until the final drawings and specifications are completed there is nothing upon which to base any sort of a hard-and-fast figure."³

Many fears—as well as misunderstandings—will be removed if it is understood that an architect does not have to be retained, if he is found unsatisfactory, "until the bitter end." "An architect may be retained and dismissed at any point of the proceedings . . . if, after having the architect of your choice make preliminary sketches in accordance with his understanding of your needs, the results are not to your satisfaction, and repeated trials fail to make them so, you are at perfect liberty to terminate the connection, pay him for the work that has been done, and engage another man."

Whether these rambling remarks will reassure the doubters I do not know. But they may at least impel the hesitating pastor to "talk it over" with some acquaintance of the profession, before embarking on a stormy sea of construction with none but the contractor to share the pilot house.

Frederic Ozanam and His Society

ARCHBISHOP GOODIER

There is a truth in Socialism, as there is in every other creed; but its basis is unsound. The same truth, founded on a more solid rock, Ozanam would have us see, proved by results, in his Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Reprinted from the Month (London).

IN the month of May, 1933, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul will celebrate its hundredth anniversary. No doubt between now and then much will be written about the Society, nor will a year necessarily exhaust the record of its achievements. But in reviewing that record emphasis must be laid on what exactly the Society stands for in the mind of its Founder. For to him it was much more than just a work of Christian charity. Its primary rule, one always impressed on those who join it, tells us expressly that its first object is the sanctification of its members. Though not

²American Institute of Architecture, *loc. cit.*

³Pencil Points, *loc. cit.*, page 577.

twenty-one years of age when he gathered together his first band of young men to do Christ's work in Paris slums, Ozanam had already developed a social philosophy of his own, and his Society was really a bold attempt to prove the soundness of that philosophy by results. Already, when only seventeen years of age, he had drawn up a vast plan of historical apologetic from which he early deduced certain principles, the application of which would vindicate their truth. Thus his Society was a distinct challenge to the spirit of his age; he would be more democratic than the most voluble democrat, but exemplify his theories in deeds. Whilst appreciating to the full the external works of this great Association and the good which it does its members, it is well, too, to investigate the sources of all its spiritual activity. Accordingly, as a prelude to much that will be written later, we propose here to study the mind of the Society's Founder, so as to set forth what he intended it to represent, as distinct from other philanthropic societies about it.

It is remarkable how, during the last twenty years or more, the name of Frédéric Ozanam has begun to stand out among those of his generation. Though he was a contemporary of men like Montalembert, Lacordaire, and de Maistre, though he died at the early age of forty, and though it may well be that all of these excelled him in natural talents, nevertheless as time has gone on students have begun to recognize in Ozanam two great features which tend to place him before them all. On the one side was his astonishing breadth of outlook, on the other the practical application of the principles he maintained. If Ozanam was essentially a man of his time, if he seemed to reflect in his writings the very soul of the early nineteenth century, still he reflected it from a mirror that took in as well the whole of the Christian Era. If on the other hand he must be placed among the Church's greatest apologists, if his reading of history puts him in a high place among her thinking men, still, as the work he has established proves, he was not content with theory only; with the genius of a practical optimist he set his hand to a task which must at that time have well seemed Utopian, but which a hundred years of experience have shown to be sound, and fruitful, and lasting.

It is not necessary to dwell long on the age in which

Ozanam lived. He was born in 1813, two years before Waterloo; he was twelve years of age when Saint-Simon died, the founder of what may be called the new republican religion, the religion of science, and universal brotherhood, and progress, the religion of Socialism. When from the opposite camp appeared *L'Avenir*, with its motto: "God and Liberty," and with leaders like Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert to father it, Ozanam was still only seventeen. He lived through the generation which saw the laicizing of education in France, and during which, under men like Quinet and Michelet, Thiers and Mignet, Louis Blanc and Lamartine, the religion of the first Revolution took on a new life. He listened to the long-drawn bombardment that went on between the Society of Jesus and the University of Paris. He heard Quinet sum up the controversy in his dictum: "Either Jesuitism must destroy the soul of France, or the soul of France must destroy Jesuitism"; but by "the soul of France" he learnt with those around him that what was meant was Saint-Simon's revolutionary religion. But he also heard a new voice, midway between the other two. From the pulpit of Notre Dame Lacordaire proclaimed the union between the Church and the people. Ozanam lived to see a new outlook grow upon both the Government and the Nation; when the Empire was restored in 1852, the year before his death, France was again, in principle at least, Catholic.

Moreover, Ozanam's upbringing, and the influences brought to bear upon him, were such as to make him peculiarly representative of his generation. Born in Lyons, the son of a doctor, his family and schooling were such as to give him a deep Catholic foundation. At the age of eighteen he went to Paris and there came under the influence, first of that almost saintly scientist, Ampère, next of the historical apologist, the successor of Chateaubriand, Ballanche. From Ballanche Ozanam absorbed the mind and soul of Chateaubriand; we may say that his own future apologetic was but the development, after his own manner, of what he learnt from these two. If Chateaubriand was the apologist of Christianity, Ozanam was the apologist of the Church; substitute the one word for the other, and the argument of both runs along parallel lines. From Chateaubriand the young man was drawn to the writers of *L'Avenir*, and with these he

soon became acquainted; in alliance with them, accepting the new order and determined not only to christianize but catholicize it, Ozanam found his vocation as a writer. We do not wonder that he became specially dear to Lacordaire. The latter would have had him with himself among his restored Dominican brethren; God had other designs. Ozanam, susceptible, sensitive, enthusiastic, was subject to forces such as these bearing always upon him, and in some sense showed their influence in everything he wrote; yet the work he actually accomplished differed from that of any of them, and bore fruit in a way that, had he lived, would surely have surprised himself.

For his own confession, many times repeated in his letters and in his other writings, Ozanam set out to be an apologist of the Church. He tells us in more than one place how during the first experiences in Paris his faith was shaken, how doubt which he detested for a time took hold of him, how by the aid of a wise confessor he came again into the sunshine, and how in return for that relief and joy he vowed to devote his pen and his life to the service of the Church. But at the same time he saw the other side. At the age of nineteen, when he had settled in the capital for his further studies we find him writing to a friend: "I dislike Paris; it is a lifeless city, with no faith, no love. It is like a vast corpse to which I am tied with all my youth and life; its cold freezes me, its corruption kills me." Here was the other force which pulled at him all his life; while on the one hand he would devote all his time and energy to championing the Church, and to forming groups of students who would work with him, on the other he could not, in such a place as Paris, remain a theorist and no more, he must form like groups who would put his theories into practice in the Babylon about him.

That these two forces, pulling in opposite directions, seriously affected what may be called the vocation of Ozanam is manifest in many places. By nature he was drawn to the life of a student and writer, and his friends, such as Lacordaire, earnestly encouraged him to that career; but there was something else within him which stimulated him to action, and he could never rest at his desk alone. The Society of St. Vincent de Paul was only one, though in the end it proved to be the chief one and most lasting, of the

œuvres which he took in hand. He was a prominent supporter of the Society of the Propagation of the Faith; he worked hard for the cause of freedom in education; he was one of the founders of the journal, *l'Ere Nouvelle*; he instituted courses of lectures and study circles for working men; he defended the right of Sunday rest; during the revolutionary period of 1848 we find him with his friends serving in the national guard. Last of all, in the midst of all his labors, he had an apostolate entirely his own among the youth about him passing through the same sea of doubt that he himself had traversed. Indeed, some may say that this last was the greatest of his works.

One advantage for those who come after him has followed from this double attraction in the making of Ozanam; while we have as the result of his activity a world-wide institution of lay charity, we have at the same time, behind it all, the mind of a clear thinker explaining the principles on which that institution is based. Moreover, that mind was essentially historical. Ozanam's method of apologetic mainly consisted in showing what the Church had done in the past for mankind: "By their fruits you shall know them." From that he concluded to her function here and now, what she could do and what she was actually doing; and when he took up work of his own, he did it mainly as a result of, and partly in proof of his own theory. Many will object, and not without reason, that his history is colored, adapted to prove his purpose; this is the charge to which all apologists are exposed who chose to work in the field of history. But it is an objection which does not affect us here. Posterity is less concerned with Ozanam the historian than with Ozanam the social philosopher; though he set out to do lasting work in the former rôle, it is in the second that he will live.

In the first place Ozanam had an unbounded belief in the safe-guiding hand of Providence. Again and again in all his historical writings he pauses to remark upon it; when he has taken us through the most difficult periods in the history of civilization he concludes with a demonstration that anticipates Browning's well-known couplet:

God's in His heaven
All's right with the world.

Next, and following on the former, he is convinced that whatever sets-back there may be, progress is always being made. Had he lived a generation later, we can well imagine what attraction the evolutionary theory would have had for him; indeed, so ardently did he voice this principle from his earliest days that many of his friends could not but watch his development with some anxiety. Still he was well aware of these sets-back; human nature being what it was they were inevitable. "We must believe in progress," he writes in one place, "but at the same time we cannot forget the permanence of all the cravings, of all the instincts, of all the temptations with which human nature is impeded." And lastly he sees both of these essentially contained, first in Christianity in general, and then in the Church, its truest and safest foundation. The Church has preserved all that is best of the ancient paganism; she has transmitted it to the ages that have followed; she has enriched it with ever new powers, ever new perfections, ever new glories, in every domain of human activity,—such in brief is the line of Ozanam's apologetic.

In consequence, when he looks out on the world around him, or into the future before him, he sees all the panorama lit up by the light of the Church; and, vice versa, it is in the influence that she exercises upon mankind that he chiefly studies her. Christianity, by means of her faith and her charity, so he argues, has reestablished harmony in the human soul, has given it light and warmth: "and that this harmony might not be disturbed, that faith might not falter and that charity might not fail, a society has been founded, a society whose essence is faith and love and harmony, and that society is the Church." Human liberty is powerless to guide itself, much less can it guide the world. It needs an authority to lead it, to point out its limitations and the areas over which it cannot act; it needs, besides, a school of true principles and doctrine to guide it in the use of its own powers. These two controls it finds in the Church, and it finds them nowhere else; so Ozanam would explain, in terms of this world, the aphorism: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." Other methods have been tried, Protestantism in its many forms on one side, Rationalism and its varieties on the other; the one has led invariably to anarchy, the other, no less invariably, while claiming to be the cham-

pion of freedom, has always led to despotism and tyranny.

But along with the Church there has always been consistent progress; progress in civil life, progress in social development, and in these two Ozanam places all that we understand by Christian civilization. And the secret of that progress he reduces to the preservation of the two commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Other civilizations have been founded on other bases; they have lived for a time and have perished. From time to time attempts have been made to revive them; these attempts have had their day, but always the issue has been the same. They have undertaken more than they had power to accomplish; they have had no guide to lead them to any real goal; the end has always been chaos and death, and the Church has invariably been compelled to come in to build upon the ruins. She has come, not with fighting men, but with women, and slaves, and unarmed missionaries, a Clotilda, a Patrick, a Gregory the Great. She has used no terror in her conquests, she has conquered by charity. To open the minds of the poorest, not to subject them; to soften the rude manners of men, not to harden them; to spread culture among peoples who had none;—such have been and still are the methods of the Church, and by such methods she has won and still continues to win in her civilizing work.

Such in main outline, and expressed in generalities, is the argument defended by Ozanam throughout his historical apologetic. We see his mind more clearly when we descend to detail. Thus he points out how it was the Church that taught the world, both pagan and barbarian, respect for human life. It was the Church that, by teaching reverence and love for God, trained the human soul, its understanding and its will, giving the former a new and greater vision of the truth, the latter a new ideal. Truth developed the first, charity the second; men learnt both to know and to love in a totally new way, on an entirely new plane. The soul of man was above all material things. In conscience he was free, whatever tyrant laws might impose; in himself he was the brother of all men; in the realm of the soul there was an equality among men that no outward caste or class distinction could destroy. "Liberty, fraternity, equality"; Ozanam caught up the popular cry of his generation and catholicized

it. He showed that the basis on which these were being built was unstable; that long before that time they had been defended by a stronger than the revolutionaries; that they had their origin, not in the burning of the Bastille, but on Calvary.

In some sense, because of the age in which he lived, this was the first and dominating thesis of Ozanam's social philosophy; he established the rights of man, not on the natural but on the supernatural, not on justice but on charity. Justice, he said in effect, had its limitations, charity was universal; justice rather declared what one man could not do to interfere with the rights of another, charity pointed out an infinite number of ways man could help his fellow man. From this beginning he went on to the family and its constituents. It was easy for him to establish all that Christianity had done for woman and for the child; we need not here dwell upon a well-worn and uncontested theme. It was easy, too, from the same source and with the same evidence of history, to show how the Church had maintained and defended the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage bond; that bond which has preserved the Christian family, and because of which Christian civilization has been the distinct thing it is. Liberty, fraternity, equality have been extended to man, woman, and child; their limitation is only defined by mutual rights and by mutual dependence, by what he beautifully calls "the law of peace and love." Still, it is when he comes to deal with Society and its constituents that the mind of Ozanam is seen in all its splendor. Here he is able to manifest the full force of the two commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Under this guidance authority at once is made both more secure and more confined; coming from God it is both more loved and more revered, being subject to God it has its limits beyond which it may not go. History provided him with abundant proofs of the sacrifices made by the Church for the maintenance of both of these doctrines, often at one and the same time. While she has steadily supported and built up the nations, she has also stood unflinchingly for the rights of religion which are subject to God alone, and for the individual conscience; she has substituted right for force as the measure of power; she has sanctified authority by something in the

nature of a sacrament; she has developed within nations the principles of political equality, which is democracy in its truest sense. The doctrine of liberty begins, not with any revolution, but with Him who laid it down that he who would command others must first be their servant; and in like manner he who would come to all his rights as a man must first learn to obey.

These mutual rights and duties are the outcome, not of conflict but of love. What is secured by conflict only can and in the end will be lost by the same; what is secured by love and mutual regard will last as long as love abides. For the profession of conflict is to seize, the principle of love is to give; conflict compels inequality, love of its nature makes all men equal; and with this key in his hand Ozanam approached the social problems of his own and every other generation. First, was the question of poverty and the poor. He recognized the good to be found in what is called philanthropic work, but he found in them for the most part a lack of that Christian charity which alone could solve the problem. In these institutions men gave of their substance for the relief of the poor, but they did not give of their heart. They pitied the poor man, they did not honor him, they bent down to him, they did not treat him as an equal. Ozanam would not have it so. Jesus Christ had honored poverty as had none other before Him: "Blessed are ye poor," He had said, "for yours is the kingdom of Heaven," and He had emphasized His teaching by Himself remaining always a poor Man, with the poorest of men as His companions.

In this same spirit Ozanam faced the question of almsgiving; he would not look upon it as a consequence of the right of every man to live, rather he would consider it as flowing from the duty of every man to give. "It is a sacred duty," he writes, "a commandment, and not merely a counsel." It is a duty that applies to all, giver and receiver alike; and it has its sanction in the sealing words: "As often as you gave to the least of these you gave to me." He that gives is saved: "Come to me"; he that gives nothing is lost: "Depart from me"; this alone proves that it is more than a counsel of perfection. Hence the Church has extolled almsgiving, not only in regard to the necessitous poor, but by encouraging voluntary poverty among those who needed not

to be poor, who have given away all that they possessed and have chosen to live on alms; scholars and men of action, a Francis of Assisi, a Thomas Aquinas, a Francis Xavier, a Theresa, nay, to a very great extent, the Holy Father himself. He would go much further; he fought deliberately against the growing popular idea that all things have a money value; he pointed out how the State herself gives alms, under whatever name the almsgiving may be disguised. Who would say that a shilling a day is an adequate wage for one who offers himself to die at command for his country? The soldier's pay is an alms, it is not a wage; and he sums up his argument with a new definition:

"Almsgiving is a reward for service done which has no salary."

This definition, we may say, is the crowning of Ozanam's social philosophy; and its application to practical life is the key to his Society of St. Vincent de Paul. Almsgiving is no condescension; it is part-payment of a debt we owe. For what do we not owe to the poor and needy? They suffer where we do not; they serve God by suffering in a way we do not; they win for us graces from Him, which without them we would never have; they make humanity itself more like to Jesus; and in return for it all we give a poor man sixpence! Which is the greater creditor, the rich man who has given the poor man a coin, or the poor man who has given the rich man so much of the light of God? Or, again, he asks, what can repay the tears of gratitude flowing from a poor mother's heart when we have helped her, or the grip of a laborer's hand when we have given him a chance to start again? We have bestowed on them our copper or silver, they give us back what gold cannot buy. Which of us is the debtor to the other? To whom has the alms been given? Which is really the poor man of the two?

In language like this, and with illustrations such as these, Ozanam fought against the idea that the giving of alms was an act of superiority, much more a condescension. The least sensitive of men, he maintained, if they would practise almsgiving as from man to man, would soon learn "that it soars far above the insulting reproach of being a mere bestowal of favor." He had never harder words to say than when he attacked those who spoke of almsgiving as a crime; who deprived the poor man of the means of giving what he too

had to give, "a word or an act of gratitude, the last of his possessions but the greatest of all, for they are possessions which cannot be bought." Almsgiving, he repeats again and again, may be a humiliation and a shame; it may also be an honor. It is a humiliation—to quote his own words¹—

If there is nothing reciprocal about it, if you give to your brother no more than a piece of bread, an old coat, a sack of straw, which you will probably never need or want again; if you put him in the necessity, sad to any generous heart, of receiving without being able to give back; if when you help those who suffer, you seem only anxious to stifle their complaints, which trouble the streets of your town and warn you of dangers that threaten your peace.

Such almsgiving is mere humiliation, for the giver as well as for the receiver. But, on the other hand, again to quote him, it is an honor:

When it takes hold of a man and lifts him up, when it looks, first and foremost, to his soul, when it attends to his training, religious, moral, political; when it helps him to freedom from his passions and his other bonds, when it leads him to real independence and makes him a truer man. Help—he will not here call it almsgiving—is an honor and not a humiliation when to the gift of bread is joined a visit that comforts, a word of advice that clears away a cloud, a shake of the hand that revives a dying courage; when it treats the poor man with respect, not only as an equal, but in many ways as one above us, since he suffers as we do not, since he is with us as one sent by God himself, to test our justice and our charity, and by our own attitude towards him to save our own souls.

Such help, such almsgiving, he goes on:

Becomes honorable indeed, because it can be mutual, because he who receives has also something to give, because every man that offers his word of advice or consolation to-day may himself be in need of a word of advice or consolation to-morrow, because the hand you take takes yours in its turn, because the family in need that you have loved will love you no less, and because the gift you have bestowed will be more than returned when an old man, or a poor mother of a family, or a household of tiny orphans, have mentioned your name and your deed to our common Father in heaven.

To test in practice principles such as these Ozanam founded and fostered his Society of St. Vincent de Paul. His vision was that of faith, which saw man, not a mere struggling entity in the valley of this death, but a part of a greater whole; in that light he redefined, and gave a greater scope to, Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Take the human

¹The translations here given from Ozanam are free rather than literal; but the translator thinks he has kept accurately the meaning of the original.

standard only, and no man is free; brotherhood in practice is a name and no more; equality is a mirage. But lift man up to the plane of God, look at him with the eyes of God, and at once these ideals have a meaning. For in those eyes every man is master of his own soul, with which no power may interfere; every man is the brother of every other, common sons of a common Father; every man is a man, an equal of every other man, in the sight of Him who made him, and who gave His life for one and all. And since that is the truth, the greater truth, then in its light must our problems of society be solved. Rich and poor have relative meanings and more; they do not affect the man himself, who may be rich or may be poor. The rich can give, the poor can receive; but the poor also can give, and the rich can receive; and when love enlivens giving and receiving, then both alike come to the same thing. For love makes equal, love makes friendship; and between friends there is no giving and receiving, all things belong to both. It was indeed a new outlook, yet, Ozanam maintained, it was also very old. It had done wonders during nineteen hundred years, it would do them for many more. He founded his Society to prove what he said, and his confidence has not been misplaced. There is a truth in Socialism, as there is in every other creed; but its basis is unsound. That same truth, founded on a more solid rock, Ozanam would have us see, proved by results, in his Society of St. Vincent de Paul.

Marie Stopes Comes to Oxford

J. SHRADY POST

The spectacle of a charming woman standing up before a crowded lecture room of young men and denouncing with one superbly sentimental gesture all the things that women have stood for in their English family life, must have won many of her audience over to the Catholic side. The author, whose paper is reprinted from Blackfriars, gives an account of the incident.

OSTENSIBLY to deliver a serious lecture, but actually to spread birth control propaganda, Dr. Marie Stopes came to Oxford. Her talk, which had been announced as a scientific one, soon wandered off into a maze of confusing

statistics and sentimental appeal. Having tried vainly to disentangle these elements from the rest of the text, the casual observer must be forgiven for wondering whether Dr. Stopes is ever capable of either scientific or logical thought.

Dr. Stopes, who is a doctor of philosophy and not a medico, is a lively and amusing speaker, as well as a woman of considerable charm, but it is difficult to decide whether she is a sentimental scientist or a scientific sentimentalist.

Taking her audience into her confidence at the very start, Dr. Stopes, very prettily, asked them please to stop smoking, not only because it hurt her throat, "but because," with a slight feminine flutter, "I just don't like smoking." Having taken this womanly prerogative, she launched into her unwomanly subject with considerable vigor.

With a thoroughness that was somewhat breathless, Dr. Stopes sailed into the physiological and biological processes of generation and the grave patriotic duty of limiting one's off-spring, though in deference to her mixed audience, she did not give us the exact details how this was to be achieved. Though why Dr. Stopes should suddenly have felt shy, considering her previous remarks, is surprising. But the quarrel with Dr. Stopes is not for being appallingly frank, but for mixing medical terms with popular metaphors. If, as a scientist, she presents her facts clearly and scientifically, she is entitled to intelligent judgment; but if, as a sentimentalist, she proceeds to harangue her listeners, she deserves indignant criticism.

As for the lecture itself, there was nothing new, nothing original, and very little scientific about it. All the old threadbare arguments of the eugenist were there, beginning with a gloomy over-population standing three deep on each others' shoulders, and ending with a sad picture of the devitalized human mother unfavorably compared to the more fortunate ruminating animal.

There was a plea for "quality not quantity" in next year's babies, and several rather dreadful stories of "hard cases" with proper melodramatic pauses after each, pauses filled by the shocked silences of the undergraduates.

On this subject of quality, Dr. Stopes became embarrassingly personal. "You are not a beautiful enough room full to please my eye," she smiled, sizing up our various physiognomies in this awful manner, "what I should really

like to see would be a group of really god-like men and women." Sorry, Dr. Stopes, we can't please everybody, and even the ugliest of us seem beautiful to our mothers, and possibly Mr. Epstein. In that Utopia which is coming when men shall at last "endeavor to breed on more rational lines," we will doubtless do better. . . .

People would be far happier if they could control the yearly output of babies, continued Dr. Stopes, painting a harrowing picture of the little unwanted child. On this theory, most of us would never have been born. For it is never really convenient to have a baby, and babies, bless 'em, have a way of choosing the most inconvenient times to appear. In fact, it is proof of the deeply rooted maternal instinct that most of us weren't drowned before our eyes were open. Yet in spite of this, and of Dr. Stopes, babies continue to get born in increasing numbers; perhaps (this is very old-fashioned) mothers may not mind having a few babies about after all.

Dr. Stopes referred several times to various books which she had written, especially "100 Cases." Granted that the one hundred cases she mentions are all desperately hard cases, could not there be found the same number whose lives have been wrecked by the very methods which Dr. Stopes advocates? High authority in the medical profession says yes, but Dr. Stopes dismisses this opinion with a shrug. . . .

One wonders, in reading them over, if most of the one hundred cases aren't made up of the type of people who break down under life and its responsibilities under almost any pressure. Most of us could point off-hand to one hundred splendid fathers and mothers, who under great difficulty and much sacrifice are raising large families of children into decent citizens. Perhaps it is a point of view that the modern eugenicist cannot understand, but certainly, if people do the best they can and work hard, the good God will provide some way of looking after their children.

However, something must be done, says Dr. Stopes, to make the mothers want quality, not quantity, and she has laid elaborate plans to keep us from having to stand in that undignified manner on each other's shoulders. But alas, there are two forces which stand between Dr. Stopes and her plan for a happier and brighter land. These are the politicians and the Church. . . .